REMARKS

Responsive to the lack of unity determination set forth in the Official Action of September 15, 2009, applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-6, drawn to a preimpregnated resin main fabric, with traverse.

The requirement is believed to be improper, however, and should not be repeated for the following reasons:

The Official Action suggests that the inventions identified in connection with Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under Rule 13.2 they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature.

In support of this, the Official Action states that claim 1 is either obvious over or anticipated by VAN SKYHAWK 5,508,096 and the special technical feature linking the two inventions of a bottom face impregnated with a first thermosetting matrix and a top face impregnated with a second thermosetting matrix does not provide a contribution over the prior art such that no single general inventive concept exists.

However, applicant believes that the claims of Group I and Group II have at least one common special technical feature in that the fabric of both claims 1 and 7 is provided with a reinforcement having a bottom face impregnated with a first thermosetting matrix and a top face impregnated with a second thermosetting matrix. Thus, the same fabric has the bottom face

impregnated with a first thermosetting matrix and a top face impregnated with a second thermosetting matrix.

By contrast, VAN SKYHAWK discloses two distinct fabrics, each fabric being impregnated with a resin (see column 3, lines 38-45). VAN SKYHAWK does not disclose or suggest that a top and bottom face of the same fabric are impregnated with first and second thermosetting matrices.

Accordingly, the above-noted common special technical feature is believed sufficient to indicate unity of invention.

In addition, the International Search Report (Form PCT/ISA/210) clearly indicates that the International Examiner considered all of claims 1-8 in the International application, and made no indication that there exists any lack of unity of invention between claims 1-6 and 7-8 in such application. The conclusion of unity of invention reached by the International Examiner is no less pertinent with respect to claims 1-8.

In light of the above discussion, it is believed that the determination of lack of unity set forth in the Official Action of September 15, 2009, is improper and must be withdrawn. An action on the merits of all claims now in the application is therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Liam McDowell/

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

LM/fb